

МОВОЗНАВСТВО

STRUCTURE OF LINGUAL-COMMUNICATIVE COMPETENCE OF PERSONALITY

Lyubov Struhanets

Doctor of philological sciences, professor,
the department of the Ukrainian Language and Methodology of Teaching,
Ternopil V. Hnatiuk National Pedagogical University (UKRAINE),
46027, Ternopil, M. Kryvonosa Str., 2, e-mail: lyubovstruhanets@yahoo.com
UDC: 811.161.2'271

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is the analysis of terminological contents of «lingual-communicative competence» meaning. The history of concepts, formation has briefly covered in this article. Wide range of terms which verbalize it, has been presented. Complex description of semantic content concept through three basic segments: lingual, socio-lingual and pragmatic competence – has been firstly proposed.

Lingual competence is level of using all kinds of norms and complex of communicative features of literary language. Socio-lingual competence of individual is an evidence of the quality representation of its lingua-cognitive characteristic, the ability to chose and apply linguistic means according to the situation of communication; understand the social stratification of language; adequately use knowledges of national culture, the specifics of intercultural communication. Pragmatic competence of speaker – it is quality of implementation of intention through well chosen lingual-communicative strategies and tactics using the most productive language means in a particular communicative situation.

Pervasive and persuasiveness of such classification is confirmed by correlation with known level model of linguistic identity by Y. Karaulov. As a result lingual-communicative competence is characterized as a person's ability to effectively use language resources to perform communicative tasks in different situations of communication.

Key words: lingual-communicative competence, lingual competence, socio-lingual competence, pragmatic competence, verbal communication.

Струганець Любов. Структура мовнокомунікативної компетенції особистості

Мета наукової розвідки – проаналізувати термінологічний зміст поняття «мовнокомунікативна компетенція». У статті стисло висвітлено історію формування поняття, представлено широкий спектр термінів, які його вербалізують. Уперше запропоновано комплексний опис змістового наповнення поняття через три базових сегменти: мовну, соціолінгвальну і прагматичну компетенцію. Мовна компетенція – це рівень володіння усіма типами норм і комплексом комунікативних ознак літературної мови. Соціолінгвальна компетенція особистості є свідченням якості представлення її лінгвокогнітивних характеристик, уміння вибирати та застосовувати мовні засоби відповідно до ситуації спілкування; розуміти соціальної стратифікацію мови; адекватно використовувати знання особливостей національної культури, специфіки міжкультурного спілкування. Прагматична компетенція мовця – це якість реалізації інтенції через вдало обрані мовнокомунікативні стратегії і тактики за допомогою найпродуктивніших мовних засобів у певній комунікативній ситуації.

Перекональність і всеохопність такої класифікації підтверджено кореляцією із відомою рівневою моделлю мовної особистості Ю. Караулова. У результаті мовнокомунікативну компетенцію схарактеризовано як здатність особистості ефективно використовувати мовні засоби для виконання комунікативних завдань у різних ситуаціях спілкування.

Ключові слова: мовнокомунікативна компетенція, мовна компетенція, соціолінгвальна компетенція, прагматична компетенція, вербальна комунікація.

In modern linguistics and lingua-didactics a lot of works devoted to language training of personality. There are works of S. Yermolenko, L. Matsko, V. Melnychayko, A. Semenov, N. Holub, T. Symonenko, N. Ostapenko, K. Klymova and others. However, the problem of complex understanding of lingual-communicative competence in the new paradigm of scientific knowledge is still actual.

For the first time the concept of «linguistic competence» coined by the American linguist N. Chomsky. He contrasted the «linguistic competence» to «the use of language in a specific situation» or «the implementation of language», «language activity» (performance) [12]. Proposed by N. Chomsky dichotomy competence / performance in the interpretation of language ability and language activity of person can be considered as one of the first attempts of explicit definition of «proficiency», if not extreme «grammatyzm» interpretation of competence, taking into account only the actual linguistic aspect and completely neglect social and pragmatic factors.

Two years later, D. Hymes declared that knowledge of the language includes not only the possession of its grammar and vocabulary, but also an idea about the conditions in which certain words and grammatical constructions should or must be used. D. Hymes introduced the concept of «communicative competence» and proved its necessity. According to the scientist, sociolinguistic (or, more broadly, communicative) competence enables a person to be not just a speaker but a member of the system due to social communication. For the sociolinguistic description of language ability of human and its manifestation in language activity, by D. Hymes, there are three essential components: verbal repertoire, language traditions and patterns – notion about the types of organizations of different genre texts, about the rules of communication of two or more speakers, and communicative behavior [13, p. 280].

Researcher W. Chafe also stressed on the output of generated processes of language form that is outside the system, in the scope of the use of language. He said: «The theory of language competence should be relevant to the use of language and there is no reason to believe that the more obscured is the nature of this relationship, the better for theory. On the contrary, when other things being equal the competence theory is more closely associated and with actual knowledge of the language and has more advantages than the one that has to do with him more remote» [9, p. 82].

On the necessity of studying of human language ability in connection with the processes of socialization, with a wide social context in which occurs the language activity of people, pointed by W. Labov, S. Ervin-Tripp, C. Fillmore, L. Krysina. In the mid 60's – early 70's in theory of lingua-didactics outlined the communicative-pragmatic approach, which was called «communicative revolution». This contributed to the consideration of the language system in close relationship with the conditions of its use and function, digestion and the changes that occur in the process of communication.

In modern Ukrainian linguistics terms «communicative competence» and «lingual-communicative competence» operating parallel, but dominant is the first one: «Communicative competence (lat. *competens* – the proper, appropriate) – a body of knowledge about communication in different conditions and with different communicators, and the ability of their effective usage in specific communication as a sender and recipient» [4, p. 13]. We believe that the term «lingual-communicative competence» more accurately describes the object of our studies because the term «lingual-communicative» clarified verbal aspect of communication.

Overall in the works of domestic linguists [1, 4, 5, 11] highlighted a number of components of lingual-communicative (or communicative) competence. Often called species such as: lingual (knowledge by participants of communication standards and rules of literary language and the skillful usage of them in producing statements); sociolinguistic (ability to understand and produce speech in a specific sociolinguistic context of communication); pragmatic, discourse, genre (ability to combine discourses in a coherent texts and enlist them to the appropriate discourses); illocutionary (ability to create and implement the communicative intent into the message); strategic (ability to effectively participate in communicating, choosing the right strategy and tactics); sociocultural, lingua-cultural, intercultural (ability to understand and use various elements of national culture (customs, norms) in specific situations with consideration of specificity of national cultures in intercultural communication); cognitive-gnoseologic (the ability

to learn a language picture of the world); paraverbal (possession of non-verbal means that accompany speech and take part in the transmission of information) and others.

Because of operating a large list of terms that denoting components of lingual-communicative competence, the Commission of language issues at the Council of Europe offered a short list that has integrated above-mentioned types of competence. In the Common-European recommendations singled linguistic, sociolinguistic and pragmatic competence [2, p. 13]. Such significant reduction of the list is quite right. However, in our belief, it is useful to distinguish between the lingual and linguistic competence. Linguistics competence is mainly inherent to philologists, because it's a complex of scientific knowledge about the language and skills to operate by linguistic knowledge in different kind of activities. Accordingly, the term «sociolinguistic competence» should be replaced by «sociolingual competence». Thus, **we believe that the components of the concept of «lingual-communicative competence» are lingual, socio-lingual and pragmatic competence.**

Each type of competence – it is again the integration of various segments. The first segment of lingual-communicative competence is **lingual competence**. Speakers should know: the norms of modern Ukrainian literary language, organization of resources of national dictionary base, communication features of literary language; be able to: exercise self-control and self-analysis of their own language activity; use dictionaries and reference books of various types to improve language culture; to have: the system of standards of modern literary language; the complex of communicative features of literary language, speech technology.

Taking into account, in society the formation of linguistic standard depends first of all from the quality of communication in the field of education and the importance of high language culture of teacher is significant. Feature of exemplary language –compliance of literary norms [see 8]. Standards of modern Ukrainian literary language included the following types:

- pronunciation norms: accentual norms (norms, which determine correct word stresses) and orthoepici norms (norms, which regulates correct pronunciation of words);
- lexical-phraseological norms (distinguishing of meanings and semantic shades of words, phraseology, regularity of lexical compatibility);
- grammatical norms: word-building (choice of morphemes in word), morphological (forms of word), and syntax norms (construction of phrases and sentences);
- orthographical norms: orthographical norms (conventional rules of conveying language (words and their forms) in writing) and punctuation norms (rules of punctuation use);
- stylistic norms (rules governing the feasibility of linguistic expressive means using in a particular lexical environment, appropriate communication situation. Stylistic rules restrict the use of standardized literary unit (word form) by a certain style of language).

The understanding of modern identity resources of national dictionary base organizations contributes to development of linguistic competence. The term «national dictionary base» linked with the expansion in sphere of functioning of the Ukrainian language, creating a new generation of Ukrainian academic vocabulary and their electronic equivalents for computer information systems. As noted by V. Shyrov, V. Manako, called the national language resources such that by their content can significantly impact the national security of Ukraine and its information sovereignty, including lexicographical provisions enforce of the Constitution of Ukraine – Article 10 (Ukrainian state language), Article 17 (information security of Ukraine in ensuring the security of the state language); the best examples of national documentary sources of the Ukrainian language, basic linguistic (including lexicographical) works, basic language products, technologies and services [10].

An important component of language competence of individual – having complex of communication signs of literary language. Communicative features – real properties, characteristics of its semantic contents and formal expressions that are built on the basis of certain types of relationships. There are the following communicative properties of language: language correctness, language accuracy, language consistency, language purity, language figurativeness, language expressiveness, language richness, language diversity, language appropriateness, language relevance, language accessibility, language sufficiency, language brevity, language rapidity, language plainness, language emotionality, language aesthetics, language effectiveness [see 7]. Basic characteristics of quality of lingual communication – correctness, compliance of norms of modern literary language. Accuracy of language is in express of thought adequately to the object or phenomenon of reality. Logical expression

describes the structure of statement, its organization. Riches of language represent the amount of active dictionary of personality. Variety shows use of various linguistic units to express the same meaning. Figurativeness of language – a communicative property of language that is aimed at making additional associations i.e. using words and phrases in their unusual environment, especially in tropes. Availability of language represent the perception of information by communicants. Pithiness of language is determined by informational content of expression, due to its topic of statement. Emotionality of language expresses the individual system of feelings, emotions, moods, attitudes of individuality to expression. Sample literary language appears as the result of interaction of these communication features.

High technique of speech serves for quality of communications – a set of techniques of phonation breathing, speech voice and diction, which proven to the extent of automated skills that allows the individual to interact successfully with others.

The second segment of lingual-communicative competence – **socio-lingual competence**. Speakers should know: features of speech etiquette in the professional field; explication parameters of language picture of the world of the individual; be able to: produce linguistic facts with consideration of conditions and tasks of communication in different types of educational discourse; realize in lingual practice social and historical formed category of worldview, system of moral and ethical concepts of personality; to have: technology of production of professional texts.

Socio-lingual competence of individual is an evidence of the quality representation of its lingua-cognitive characteristic, the ability to choose and apply linguistic means according to the situation of communication; understand the social stratification of language; adequately use knowledges of national culture (for example, expressions of folk wisdom), the specifics of intercultural communication.

Types of communication expect compliance of ethical rules that govern behavior. The set of such rules called linguistic etiquette. Etiquette statements include greeting, farewell, gratitude, forgiveness, wishes and so on. They form the thematic integration of the various language pieces with different structure (words, phrases, sentences). Each thematic associations – is an extensive system of means and expression of linguistic etiquette, so we can say about some kind of synonymy formulas of politeness. Choice of number from the synonymic line is determined by many factors: the situation of communication, social roles of interlocutors, education, profession, age, gender.

The third segment of lingual-communicative competence – **pragmatic competence**. Speakers should know: lingual-communicative strategies and tactics; be able to: observe basic principles of communication; have: best strategies and tactics to implement communicative intentions in the didactic interaction; habits of persuasive communicative influence.

Pragmatic competence of speaker is the quality of implementation of intention through well chosen lingual-communicative strategies and tactics using the most productive language means in a particular communicative situation. In verbal communication it is the most common category of discourse. This type of communication, interactive phenomenon that has different forms of expression (oral, written), and determined by the strategy and tactics of participants and depends on the cognitive, lingual and non-lingual (social, mental, psychological) factors. The elements of discourse are lingual genres and lingual acts.

For example, pedagogical discourse is dominant in an educational environment. This is a kind of communication that occurs within educational social institution and has an aim – to socialized new members of society and characterized status and role of relations of participants (teacher – student). The dominant language discourse of pedagogical genres are lessons, lectures, workshops, laboratory sessions and others. A. Semenyuk, V. Parashchuk distinguish in the pedagogical discourse the complex of communicative strategies of teacher on functional feature: 1) explanatory communication strategy (providing sequence of intentions that aimed at informing), 2) estimate communication strategy (expressing the degree of importance of the teacher as a representative of the norms of society and realized in the right of a teacher to assess how the events and characters in the circumstances referred to in teaching and student achievement), 3) the control communication strategy (aimed at obtaining objective information on mastering student material, understanding and adoption of value system of society), 4) promoting communication strategy (supporting student and fixing its erroneous actions), 5) organizing communication strategy (focused on organization of joint of action partners of

communication, such as etiquette and legislative moves) [6, p. 194]. Undoubtedly, in the real pedagogical discourse intentions usually vary and realization of lingual-communicative strategies is to due lingual-communicative tactics.

A particular genre kind of lingual-communicative activity of personality is public speech. It fully implemented the system of mental-speech actions – skillful use of forms of human thinking (logical-shaped) and language means of expression. Depending on the content, purpose, method of declaration and communication circumstances distinguish such genres of public speaking: report, speech, messages and others. Human activity, which profession is associated with the public speaking, requires the acquisition of a skill in choosing the genre, the formulation of the theme, selecting facts and sequence of its presentation, and also need a high culture of language in general.

As we have already noted, lingual-communicative competence is structured concept that consists of three segments. This is our division and it correlates quite well with the known model of linguistic identity that represented by Y. Karaulov in 1987 in the monograph «Russian language and language personality» [3]. Structure linguistic identity, according to the scientist, allegedly consists of three levels: 1) zero, verbal and semantic; 2) the first cognitive; 3) the second, pragmatic. Verbal-semantic level (sometimes referred lexicon) provides for the speaker possession Fund lexical and grammatical language, and for researchers – the traditional description of formal means of expressing certain values. Language intelligence of individual is seen already at the level of cognitive study of linguistic identity (sometimes it is called as level of thesaurus). The units of this level are intellections, ideas and concepts that form in every linguistic identity more or less orderly «world picture» that called thesaurus and reflects the hierarchy of values. The pragmatic level (pragmatykon) of analysis of linguistic identity includes the identification and characterization of the motives, goals, interests, system of social roles, intentions that govern the individual in the process of communication, its development, behavior, and as a final result they determine the hierarchy of means and values in its linguistic model of the world. This level of analysis provides in analysis of lingua personality a logical and linguistic identity caused by the transition from the language of its assessments to the real understanding of the world.

Correlation of our proposed components of lingual-communicative competence and levels of linguistic identity that allocated by Y. Karaulov, as follows: lingual competence ↔ verbal-semantic level of linguistic identity, sociolingual competence ↔ linguistic-cognitive level of linguistic identity, pragmatic competence ↔ pragmatic level of linguistic identity. This confirms that the concept of lingual-communicative of personality is all-embracing due to representation of quality and all kinds of speech activity.

Also we pay attention to such moment. Terminology is quickly updating in the last decade. We observe numerous terms-attributes for the concept of «lingual-communicative / communicative competence», that claiming on the role of the widest concept. We believe that we should not complicate this key term that is interdisciplinary (operates in linguistics, lingua-didactics, pedagogy). It is important to standardize terminology, which began fixing.

So, lingual-communicative competence is the ability of the individual to use effectively language means for performing communicative tasks in different situations of communication. The current situation in the country puts special demands on the subject of professional communication. In this context the system of language training of spesialists in universities requires the study.

REFERENCES

1. Бацевич Ф. С. Основи комунікативної лінгвістики: підручник / Ф. С. Бацевич. – К. : Видавничий центр «Академія», 2004. – 344 с.
2. Загальноєвропейські рекомендації з мовної освіти: вивчення, викладання, оцінювання / [наук. ред. українського видання С. Ю. Ніколаєв]. – К. : Ленвіт, 2003. – 273 с.
3. Караулов Ю. Русский язык и языковая личность / Ю. Н. Караулов; [отв. ред. Д. Шмелев]. – М. : Наука, 1987. – 263 с.
4. Мацько Л. І. Культура української фахової мови: навчальний посібник / Л. І. Мацько, Л. В. Кравець. – К. : ВЦ «Академія», 2007. – 360 с.

5. Селіванова О. Сучасна лінгвістика: термінологічна енциклопедія / О. Селіванова. – Полтава : Довкілля – К, 2006. – 716 с.
6. Семенюк О. Основи теорії мовної комунікації: навчальний посібник / О. Семенюк, В. Паращук. – К. : Видавничий центр «Академія», 2010. – 240 с.
7. Струганець Л. В. Культура мови. Модульний курс: навчальний посібник для студентів філологічних факультетів вишів України / Л. В. Струганець. – Тернопіль : ТНПУ імені Володимира Гнатюка, 2012. – 195 с.
8. Струганець Л. В. Культура української мови і мовна особистість учителя: автореф. дис. на здобуття наук. ступеня канд. філол. наук: спец. 10.02.01 «Українська мова» / Л. В. Струганець. – К., 1996. – 22 с.
9. Чейф У. Л. Значение и структура языка / У. Л. Чейф. – М. : Прогресс, 1975. – 432 с.
10. Широков В. А. Організація ресурсів національної словникової бази / В. А. Широков, В. В. Манак // Мовознавство. – 2001. – № 5. – С. 3–13.
11. Шумарова Н. П. Мовна компетенція особистості в ситуації білінгвізму / Н. П. Шумарова. – К. : КЛДУ, 2000. – 248 с.
12. Chomsky N. Aspects of the theory of syntax / N. Chomsky. – Cambridge, Mass. : M. I. T. Press, 1965. – 251 p.
13. Hymes D. On Communicative Competence / D. Hymes // Sociolinguistics. – Harmondsworth : Penguin, 1972. – P. 269–293.